

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the application identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the above amendments, claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 have been amended by replacing "90%" with "80%",. Support for such amendments can be found in the instant specification at least at pages 5, 6, 8 and 9.

At the outset, it is noted that in the previous response filed on September 2, 2008, Applicant indicated that a verified translation of the foreign priority application would be filed. Applicant believes that the claims are distinguishable from the applied art for the reasons discussed below, and as such, the translation of the foreign priority application is not being filed in the Patent Office at this time.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 03/034104 (*WO '104*). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As discussed in Applicant's previous response, *WO '104* fails to disclose each feature recited in independent claims 1 and 11, and as such fails to constitute an anticipation of such claims. For example, *WO '104* does not disclose particles having an average particle diameter which are substantially monodisperse, in combination with other aspects recited in claim 1. Further, *WO '104* does not disclose that the particle in the hard coat layer satisfies a relationship represented by the formula (1): $0 \mu\text{m} \leq d_{\text{Max}} - d_{\text{AC}} \leq 7 \mu\text{m}$, as recited in claim 11. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the MX300 beads employed in *WO '104* are

not substantially monodisperse, but rather have a comparatively broad particle size distribution. Further, it is far from certain in light of the disclosures that the MX300 beads satisfy the relationship represented by the formula (1) recited in claim 11. These deficiencies of *WO '104* are discussed in greater detail at pages 9-11 of the Amendment filed September 2, 2008.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *WO '104* and further in view of a JPO website machine translation of Japanese Patent Document No. 10-268111. Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *WO '104*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,195 (*Nelson*). Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-18 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0060849 (*Matsunaga et al '849*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0142133 (*Matsunaga et al '133*). Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Matsunaga et al '849* in view of *Matsunaga et al '133*, and further in view of *Nelson*.

Without addressing the propriety of the Examiner's comments concerning the above rejections, it is noted that such rejections are moot in view of the Amendment filed on September 2, 2008, in which the subject matter of claims 3 and 13 was incorporated into independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. In this regard, claims 3 and 13 have not been listed in any of the above rejections. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Matsunaga et al '849* in view of *Matsunaga et al '133*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,945,656 (*Takahashi et al*). As discussed above, claims 3 and 13 have been canceled, and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 11 are non-obvious over the above applied art for at least the following reasons.

At pages 18-19 of the Official Action, the Patent Office has acknowledged that *Matsunaga et al '849* and *Matsunaga et al '133* fail to disclose or suggest at least one hard coat layer including a light-diffusing layer, the light-diffusing layer having a scattered light intensity at 30° of 0.01 to 0.2% based on the light intensity at an exit angle of 0° in a scattered light profile measured by a goniophotometer, as recited in claims 1 and 11. Applicant submits that *Takahashi et al* fails to cure such deficiencies of the other applied documents.

In this regard, the Patent Office has relied on *Matsunaga et al '849* for disclosing the use of particles to impart light-diffusing properties. See Official Action at page 18. *Takahashi et al*, on the other hand, relates to an anti-glare layer prepared by forming a phase separation structure by spinodal decomposition from a liquid phase, curing the resin precursor to form the anti-glare layer, and the liquid phase contains at least one polymer, at least one curable resin precursor, and a solvent. See col. 4, lines 8-35. That is, rather than using particles in the anti-glare layer, *Takahashi et al* teaches obtaining anti-glare properties through the use of phase-separation by spinodal decomposition. This is in stark contrast with *Matsunaga et al '849*, which has been relied on for the use of particles in its antiglare film to impart light-diffusing properties. In view of the completely different means for

attaining light-diffusing properties employed in *Takahashi et al* and *Matsunaga et al* '849, it would not have been obvious to combine the applied art in the manner suggested by the Patent Office. *Matsunaga et al* '849 has no indication that the light-diffusing characteristics of its antiglare film are deficient in any way. And the skilled artisan would not have construed the scattering light intensity characteristics shown in the figures of *Takahashi et al* as instructions for modifying *Matsunaga et al* '849, since *Takahashi et al* employs a completely different means for attaining such light-diffusing characteristics.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1 and 11 are non-obvious over *Matsunaga et al* '849, *Matsunaga et al* '133 and *Takahashi et al*. Accordingly, withdrawal of the above §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.


From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 2, 2008

By:


 Roger H. Lee
 Registration No. 46317

P.O. Box 1404
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
 703 836 6620